

PLANNING COMMISSION
Minutes of October 11, 2004, Meeting

Members Present: Linda Snider, Joseph Dixon, Tom Dantzler, Rick Lucas, Mark Siegel

Staff Present: Jack Dodge, Principal Planner; Mike Scarey, Senior Planner

1. Call to Order:

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

2. Approve Minutes of September 27, 2004, Meeting:

The minutes will be amended to reflect that under Commission Liaison's Report, the final item on the Land Use & Parks meeting agenda, "Continued Discussion about Forming a Neighborhood Revitalization Committee" was not discussed.

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to accept the minutes of the September 27, 2004, meeting as amended.

3. Public Hearing:

A. Brief Presentation on Proposed Zoning Code Amendments Related to Clarifying the Parking Garage Standards within the City Center and Creating a New Definition for a "Mural" and a "Mural Sign"

Parking Garage Standards

Jack Dodge stated that language relative to parking garage standards was revised to clarify that within the City Center, only one stand alone parking structure would be allowed per development site as follows:

New Section 15.10.175.3 Development Site – Stand Alone Parking Structures

A development site is the sum total of all parcels of property incorporated into the development at any point of time.

Discussion was held about the term "at any point of time" and whether or not it met the intent of the regulations to limit parking structures within the City Center to one per development site; the fairness of allowing only one parking structure on a large development site of five or ten acres; City Council direction that parking structures within the City Center be limited to 300 parking stalls (with additional stalls allowed through incentives and/or mixed use development on the site); establishing a specific number of parking structures to be allowed rather than one per development site;

whether or not proposed language discourages or encourages parking structures; surface parking within the City Center being allowed on an interim basis with future development to be mixed use per a development agreement; a scenario where a business with 1000 surface parking stalls used for commercial park and fly would be allowed to construct a five story parking structure with an equivalent 1000 stalls grandfathered to be used for commercial park and fly with mixed use commercial development on the remainder of the site (as an incentive to develop the property); potential revenue impacts of limiting the number of parking stalls allowed for commercial park and fly; different standards applying to parking structures dedicated to commercial park and fly and parking structures as part of a mixed use development; the proposed regulations being written to provide a clear understanding to both staff and developers what is allowed on a given site.

Jack Dodge advised that staff would revise the language to clearly state that only one parking structure would be allowed per development site, regardless of when or how often the development site was expanded. He further explained that language in New Section 15.35.905 states that “Only one stand-alone parking structure shall be allowed per development site (Also see SMC 15.10.175.3) which refers back to the definition of a development site.

New Section 15.35.905 Stand Alone Parking Structures

Stand alone parking structures allowed under SMC 15.35.140, Use #094 shall comply with the following minimum requirements:

- A. Only one (1) stand-alone parking structure shall be allowed per development site (Also see SMC 15.10.175.3).**
- B. A stand-alone parking structure is limited to not more than 300 parking stalls unless additional spaces are allowed under SMC 15.35.950.**
- C. In mixed use parking structures no more than 300 parking spaces may be used for public or private commercial park-n-fly, unless additional spaces are allowed through SMC 15.35.950. All other parking spaces shall be allocated to other permitted uses on the development site.**
- D. No stand alone parking structure shall be allowed on an development site specifically created through a commercial/industrial subdivision.**
- E. Design features for stand-alone parking structures shall comply with the requirements of SMC 15.35.100 and 15.35.950.**

Murals & Mural Signs

Jack Dodge stated that at the last meeting there were concerns about the use of the terms “building façade” and “structure façade”. All references have been changed to building façade. Examples of various murals and mural signs were shown for discussion.

Discussion was held about whether or not the definition of mural and language in the regulations clearly outlined what would be allowed; regulations addressing the maintenance of murals and mural signs; what constitutes art and the subjectivity of the entire issue; allowing historical murals only; prohibiting murals entirely; allowing murals or mural signs on only one façade of a building as approved by the City; murals being an asset to the community; encouraging murals to depict SeaTac as a diverse community.

B. Public Hearing (Continued from September 27, 2004) on the Proposed Zoning Code Amendments

The Chair opened the public hearing at 5:28 p.m.
The Chair closed the public hearing at 7:05 pm

C. Discussion about Possible Recommendation to the City Council Regarding the Proposed Zoning Code Amendments

A motion was made, seconded, and unanimously passed to recommend approval of proposed amendments regarding stand alone parking structures with language revisions as discussed.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of proposed amendments regarding murals and mural signs as presented. The motion carried four to one.

4. Old Business:

A. Continued Review of 2004 Proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments’ “Final Docket” (with a focus on Land Use, Utilities, Housing & Neighborhoods, and Remaining Informational Maps)

Mike Scarey reviewed the “Final Docket” as follows:

Land Use Element (including Recommended Implementation Strategies, and Land Use Background Report)

- New Policy 1.1B-1 Encourage neighborhood scale commercial development in appropriate locations outside of the Urban Center/City Center.

- New Policy 1.1G Ensure that the future uses of Highline School District unused/unoccupied properties are compatible with adjacent neighborhoods and land uses.
- Appropriate references have been included in the Recommended Implementation Strategies portion of the Land Use Element.
- Figure A1.1 Land Use Summary Chart has been amended to reflect updated land use pattern information. Figure A1.2 Land Use Summary Table reflects the figures used to create Figure A1.1
- Land Use Capacity Estimates have been revised to incorporate buildable lands analysis information.

Housing and Neighborhood Element

- New Goal 2.7 Preserve and enhance the quality of life in existing residential neighborhoods.
- New Policy 2.7A Enhance the livability of the City's residential communities by integrating new neighborhood-scale commercial/mixed use projects with existing development in appropriate locations, using effective design standards that incorporate crime prevention site design techniques.
- New Policy 2.7B Actively promote citizen involvement and community input in issues related to neighborhood revitalization and preservation.
- Appropriate references have been included in the Recommended Implementation Strategies portion of the Housing and Neighborhoods Element.

Utilities Element

- New Policy 5.3G Encourage siting of Wireless Telecommunication Facilities (WTFs)* on City property and appropriate rights-of-way where the greatest amount of aesthetic control can be exercised, but discourage siting of WTFs on arterial rights-of-way where siting would interfere with undergrounding of other utilities.
- Appropriate references have been included in the Recommended Implementation Strategies portion of the Utilities Element.
- References will be changed to Wireless Communication Facilities (WCF)

Remaining Informational Maps

- Existing Land Use Map – Updated to reflect Figure A1.1 of the Land Use Element.

- Existing Transit Services (Map 3.3) – Updated to include Sound Transit bus routes.
- Truck Routes (Map 3.5) – Developed to identify truck routes throughout the City to minimize truck traffic on neighborhood streets.
- Wellhead Protection Areas (Map A8.1) – Developed in answer to a State requirement that area wellheads be protected. (The symbols for the circles depicting one year and five year migration rates are reversed and will be corrected.)
- Bike Routes and Pedestrian Trails (Map 9.5) – To identify these areas.

Commissioner Dantzler left the dais, and from the floor gave a presentation to explain his recommendation that Policy 3.2J of the Transportation Element be eliminated. The intent of the policy was to encourage economic redevelopment in the southern portion of the Urban Center until the 28th/24th Avenue arterial (and associated improvements to S 200 ST) project was completed within six years. The improvements have now been made; therefore, full expansion of development activity should be allowed and the 1,000,000 square foot cap removed.

Mike Scarey indicated that the Public Works Director was amenable to removing the 1,000,000 square foot cap on development within the southern portion of the Urban Center. The Planning Director will also be asked for a recommendation. He further indicated that if the 1,000,000 square foot cap was removed, it was reasonable that the entire Policy 3.2J be eliminated from the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion was held about the definition of “south access” (the definition of “interim south access” has been addressed).

Mike Scarey explained that the appropriate terminology was “south access expressway” which is a limited access freeway where State Route 509 intersects with Interstate Five leading directly into the airport terminal.

B. Continued Discussion about Proposed Amendments to the Wireless Communications Facility (WCF) Regulations

Jack Dodge outlined the new Siting Hierarchy (Option 3) as requested by the Planning Commission that would eliminate the City-owned property priority in siting facilities.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Siting Hierarchy Option 3.

The motion carried three to two.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend approval of Siting Hierarchy Option 1. The motion failed two to three.

Commissioner Dixon recommended various corrections for accuracy and clarity.

In answer to various questions, Jack Dodge explained as follows:

Topography may be used for screening wireless communication facility compounds if one area of a site is higher or lower elevation than another where a hillside could be used for screening. This would be reviewed on a case by case basis with approval subject to site conditions.

Fencing material may be of any quality wood rather than limiting fencing to cedar.

Following some discussion, it was recommended that the term "solid fencing" be used as there are now various non-wood products on the market that can be used for fencing.

Generators would be required to be enclosed within the wireless communication facility compound. Noise issues have been addressed, and are normally not problematic.

5. Commission Liaison's Report:

None.

6. Planning Director's Report:

None.

7. Adjournment:

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.